

Assessing the History and Current Status of Community Conservation at The Nature Conservancy

Long Review

A project funded by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development under contract number FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00 with Development Alternatives, Inc.

January 2000



1717 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 302, Washington, DC 20036 USA
Tel.: 202-332-2853 FAX: 202-332-8257 Internet: WIDinfo@widtech.org

A Women in Development Technical Assistance Project

Development Alternatives, Inc. ! International Center for Research on Women ! Women, Law and Development International
Academy for Educational Development ! Development Associates, Inc.

This publication was made possible through support provided by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs Field Support and Research, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Contract No. FAO-0100-C-00-6005-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

The Long Review

Assessing the History and Current Status of Community Conservation at the Nature Conservancy

*A Review of Literature for the Strategic Planning
Process of the Community Conservation Program,
International Conservation Science,
The Nature Conservancy*

by

Mary Hill Rojas, Environment Specialist
G/WID/WIDTECH/USAID in Collaboration with LAC/USAID and
The Nature Conservancy

January 2000



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Listed by Authors or Documents Reviewed

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| The Conservancy Mission and Values | |
| “Conservation by Design” | 2 |
| Sawhill, John “Nature Conservancy” | 2 |
| “Institutional Value Statement” | 2 |
| Community Conservation and the Conservancy Strategic Themes | |
| “Conservation by Design” | 2 |
| “Implementing Conservation by Design” | 4 |
| The Conservancy’s Community-Based Approach | |
| Sawhill, “Nature Conservancy” | 4 |
| “Community-based Conservation: International Program” | 4 |
| “Conservation Goals: U.S. Partnership” | 5 |
| Low, Greg | 5 |
| Community Conservation and Compatible Economic Development | |
| “Working with Communities to Save the Last Great Places” | 6 |
| Low, Greg | 6 |
| Low, Greg | 6 |
| Runnels, Bruce | 7 |
| Leon, Patricia | 7 |
| Community Conservation and The Program Strategy for the Latin American and Caribbean Region | |
| “Recommendations for a Program Strategy” | 7 |
| Community Conservation and the Parks in Peril Program | |
| “Parks in Peril Source Book” | 8 |
| “Measuring Success: Scorecard Manual” | 9 |
| Brandon, Katrina et al. | 9 |
| Community Conservation and The Conservancy’s Local People’s Program | |
| “Program Manager Job Description” | 12 |
| Dugelby, Barbara | 12 |
| “Local People’s Balancing Theme” | 12 |
| “Local People’s Working Group” | 13 |
| Dugelby, Barbara and Libby, Michelle | 13 |
| Dugelby, Barbara and Russell, Vance | 14 |

Community Conservation in the International Program Today

| | |
|---|----|
| Runnels, Bruce..... | 14 |
| Leon, Patricia..... | 14 |
| “Ecotourism Strategy”..... | 15 |
| “Program Manager Job Description”..... | 15 |
| “Strategic Plan: Andean and Southern Cone”..... | 16 |
| Ulfelder, William..... | 16 |
| “Sustainable Communities: Southern Mexico”..... | 16 |

Community Conservation and The Andean and Southern Cone:

A Regional Example

| | |
|---|----|
| “Strategic Plan: Andean and Southern Cone”..... | 16 |
| Ulfelder, William..... | 17 |

Community Conservation, The Nature Conservancy and Gender

| | |
|--|----|
| Brandon, Katrina..... | 18 |
| “Local People’s Specialist”..... | 19 |
| “Local People’s Balancing Theme”..... | 19 |
| “External Evaluation: Parks in Peril”..... | 20 |

The Tools of The Nature Conservancy

| | |
|---|----|
| Weeks, William..... | 21 |
| “Designing a Geography of Hope”..... | 22 |
| “Site Conservation Planning Workshop”..... | 23 |
| “Planificación: Conservación de Sitios”..... | 23 |
| “Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Success”..... | 24 |
| “Measuring Success: Parks in Peril”..... | 25 |

Conclusions and Recommendations

| | |
|--|----|
| Brandon, Katrina..... | 26 |
| “Implementing Conservation by Design”..... | 27 |
| “Designing a Geography of Hope”..... | 27 |

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND THE NATURE CONSERVANCY: A REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Nature Conservancy, a private international conservation organization, is committed to “community conservation,” working closely with communities in a variety of ways to assure the conservation of biodiversity. There is a recognition within the organization as Greg Low, Vice President of the Conservancy, has written, that “The job of biodiversity conservation has become an economic and social task.” (Low, “Ecosystem

The Community Conservation Program (CCP), housed in the International Program of the Nature Conservancy, was formed in 1995 as a part of the Parks in Peril Project (PIP) funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The 1998 evaluation of Parks in Peril recommended that the Community Conservation Program develop a strategic plan through a participatory process with USAID, Parks in Peril, and Conservancy staff and partners. The objectives of the strategic plan would be to provide a clear rationale for community conservation within the International Program of the Conservancy with guidance for the CCP for developing policies and selecting and implementing activities.

THE PURPOSE

This report provides one of the first steps of the strategic planning process as it presents the background and current status of community conservation within the Conservancy through a literature review of Conservancy documents. This report is one of three that emerged from the literature review. It is a complete review (“The Long Review”) and is meant to be used by Conservancy personnel who work on a daily basis with community conservation. A shorter version of this document for a more general readership is available from the Conservancy Community Conversation Program. The third document is a position paper on gender within the Conservancy.

THE ORGANIZATION

This report is divided into discrete sections according to themes that emerged from the literature review. The table of contents outlines the sections and the literature reviewed within each section.

THE CONSERVANCY MISSION AND VALUES

The Nature Conservancy is an international organization recognized as preeminent in the field of conservation. Its mission is to preserve plants, animals, and natural communities by

protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. Its conservation goal is the long-term survival of all viable native species and community types through the design and conservation of portfolios of sites within ecoregions. (Conservation by Design, 1997)

Both the mission and the goal reflect the biological and ecological orientation of the Conservancy. The relationship of conservation and human populations is not explicitly mentioned. However, “community conservation” plays a prominent role in the approach of the Conservancy. John Sawhill, President of the Nature Conservancy writes, “If ecoregional planning tells us where to work—and what to work on—it does not tell us how to work. The answer can be found in community conservation.” (Sawhill, *Nature Conservancy*, p. 6) In general, the trend for The Nature Conservancy is “...a shift from solutions to environmental problems that are centrally mandated to ones that are locally based.” (Sawhill, *Washington Post*, p. C3)

Such a locally based approach is grounded in the stated values of The Nature Conservancy. One such value is a “Commitment to People”: “Success depends on the people who work for and with The Nature Conservancy. We must actively involve women and men from a broad spectrum of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, ages, and abilities, lifestyles, and beliefs in an environment that encourages each of us to achieve our potential and values the contribution of all. We will respect the needs, values, and traditions of the communities in which we work.” (Institutional Value Statement)

Three core values are outlined in “Conservation by Design,” the framework document that translates the Conservancy mission into a common purpose and direction:

- # “We are guided by the best available conservation science to take site-based action that makes a significant and lasting difference.”
- # “We work in a non-confrontational manner, emphasizing the effectiveness of
- # “We recognize the imperative of developing ways to enable humans to live productively and sustainably while conserving biological diversity.” (Conservation by Design, p. 1)

The importance of collaboration and the recognition of the interaction of humans and conservation within these values is clear.

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND THE CONSERVANCY STRATEGIC THEMES

Eight broad strategic themes, directly linked to the Conservancy mission, “provide a structure for developing programs that will create the best chance of achieving both long-term and short-term success....” (Conservation by Design, p. 2) The themes are: Conservation and Stewardship of Lands and Waters; Science-Based Decisions; Compatible Human Uses of Lands and Waters; Conservation Policy Framework; Partnership and Leadership; Learning and Innovation; Funding; and Conservation Ethic.

lays out three strategies “to provide the organization with strategic direction and focus.” (Implementing Conservation by Design, p. 2) The strategies are: a) site-based conservation; b) exporting and importing lessons; c) increasing the use of Heritage Information.

Of the three, the first strategy, site-based conservation, speaks directly to community conservation. It is here that the Conservancy definition of community-based conservation is given: Community conservation is “the presence of a Conservancy practitioner working in partnership with key stakeholders at a site to develop lasting solutions that abate key threats. (The success of community-based conservation rests on a holistic approach bringing together

ecological, economic and community interests.)” (Implementing Conservation by Design, p. 7) This strategy works in tandem with adaptive management by “vigorously establishing conservation objectives, evaluating our progress towards those objectives through practical monitoring protocols, and updating our strategies to ensure that our resources are effectively applied.” (Implementing Conservation by Design, p. 7) Therefore, there are two action steps: a) to build central mentoring and logistical support for community-based conservation and adaptive management; b) to revise the site conservation planning methodology to more explicitly include components of community-based conservation strategies...” (Implementing Conservation by Design, p. 6)

THE CONSERVANCY’S COMMUNITY-BASED APPROACH

Several documents assist in the development of a rationale for community conservation within the Nature Conservancy. The first, “The Good Neighbor Policy: Working People to People, We Make Conservation Happen,” by John Sawhill. He asserts that conservation is writing that “our long term success depends on unleashing the enormous latent power of a community’s love of place.” (Sawhill, 1998, p. 6) He states that local communities are the key to conservation and “without their support we can never achieve our goals.” He ends by emphasizing that “our most significant accomplishment will be to have conservation leaders committed to place and community.” The emphasis on economic factors dominant in the strategic themes of “Conservation by Design” is missing from this vision.

The Nature Conservancy works both within the United States of America and internationally in Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, the Pacific and Canada. A second document, “Community-Based Conservation: International Program,” from the international side of the Conservancy also contributes to the development of a rationale for community conservation. As with the John Sawhill article, this document recognizes that “without local support conservation cannot succeed” (Community-based Conservation, p. 3) It acknowledges that “We work with communities because in the end they are the guardians of their biodiversity.” (Community-based Conservation, p. 4)

Although the document mentions that “In Latin American countries, the dynamic between protecting biodiversity and combating poverty is extremely complex and fragile” the document does not highlight economic factors. (Community-based Conservation, p. 3) Rather the emphasis is on understanding the concerns of the people, using that understanding to inform, involve and empower communities and realizing the potential local people have to be conservation’s strongest allies. (Community-based Conservation, p. 3) More specifically the document points out that The Conservancy and their partners work with local people to build support for the protected area and to conserve its natural resources by:

- # Building awareness and trust
- # Engaging local communities in managing protected areas

- # “The initiative must be broadly-based. It cannot be seen as something coming from the top down, something brought to citizens for their input or something masterminded by local government or one strong organization”;
- # “The initiative must be adaptive and able to respond to local needs. The organizing process often involves feeling out a particular course, testing the waters and then proceeding”; and
- # “The community must be ready to embrace a process for change and improvement.”
(Low et al., p. 5)

Both the international and the domestic programs of the Nature Conservancy highlight an approach to conservation that involves the community. The domestic program emphasizes a *community-based* approach where Conservancy staff live within the community to work on conservation issues. However, the international side has begun to use the term *community conservation* which reflects an approach that focuses on community activities related to conservation that are implemented through Conservancy partners who may or may not live in the community.

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND COMPATIBLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Compatible Economic Development is a term that dominates the discussion of community conservation within the Nature Conservancy and, therefore, deserves a closer look. For example, the recent, major capital campaign is titled “Working with Communities to Save the Last Great places.” However, the campaign places special emphasis on “striving to ensure that our efforts to protect the ecological values of the area also reflect the *economic* concerns of the community. (“Working with Communities

Compatible development is often used interchangeably with compatible economic development. The Conservancy’s “Center for Compatible Economic Development” defines “compatible development” as “the production of goods and services, the creation and maintenance of businesses, and the pursuit of land uses that conserve the environment, enhance the local economy and achieve community goals.” (Low et al., p. 1) This goal is reached from within the community itself, using a collaborative strategic approach.

In the document “Ecosystem Conservation and Economic Development,” Greg Low, Conservancy Vice President, writes that the Conservancy “...seeks to protect large natural systems and has found a plethora of serious threats to these systems. The threats extend far beyond habitat destruction; they include less direct, but equally serious threats such as agricultural practices that cause sedimentation and nutrient enrichment in adjoining aquatic systems. In fact, the vast majority of bioreserves cannot be protected solely by direct habitat conservation. To save these ecosystems, the Conservancy must address a variety of threats which cannot be solved through traditional land protection.” (Low, “Ecosystem

Low continues that conservation practitioners therefore must act at three different levels to address ecosystem threats and preserve biological diversity. His use of the term compatible development helps in its definition. This triad involves:

- # Preventing *incompatible development* by providing information and technical assistance to local citizens and decision-makers—(e.g., preventing imminent development threats such as highways; poor sewage treatment). (Low, “Ecosystem...,” p. 2)
- # Promoting *compatible development* by providing alternatives to economic forces that threaten ecosystems (e.g., protecting waterfront farms with conservation easements to prevent high-density development). (Low, “Ecosystem...,” p. 3)
- # Securing *sustainable local economies* by meeting “the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” (e.g., securing systemic changes in local socio-economic systems). (Low, “Ecosystem...,” p. 5)

In an attempt to clarify when the Conservancy should be involved with “compatible development” a Conservancy conservation committee developed two criteria that must be met: a) The proposed use is primarily designed to mimic or restore essential ecological

processes; and b) The proposed use will reduce threat to the conservation target and not otherwise degrade the relevant ecological processes. Although the committee uses the term compatible human use, they emphasize compatible economic development. “These strategies hold great promise for bringing economic forces to bear in a positive way on our mission, as recognized in Conservation by Design, and that is why we have established experiments in compatible economic development as an organizational priority.” (Runnels, p. 1)

The director of the Compatible Economic Development Department of the international program of the Nature Conservancy, Patricia Leon, reviewed the involvement of the Latin America and Caribbean Region of the Conservancy in compatible economic development activities. For the review Leon defines compatible economic development activities as “all environmentally compatible activities that include an economic component.” (Leon, p. 5) She comments that it is “evident that the LAC region’s primary concern is to have a clear link between the sponsorship of compatible economic activities and the accomplishment of our conservation goals.” (Leon, p. 3) She relies on the Conservancy’s basic document, “Conservation by Design,” for a rationale for economic activities: “Long term conservation of the portfolios will depend on private enterprise employing innovative approaches that are based on an appreciation of the interdependent relationship between long-term economic prosperity and ecological health.” (Leon, p. 1)

In the Leon document one of the most frequently expressed concerns of Conservancy staff with regard to compatible economic development activities was to answer the question: Why should the Conservancy be involved with economic development? (Leon, p. 3) The review found that the rationale for implementing economic activities has been to protect biodiversity by “providing alternative sources of income to local peoples, adding economic value to the land...and generating revenues to further the conservation agenda and strengthen local institutions” (Leon, p. 4) Also support of these activities responds to partner demand and demonstrates The Nature Conservancy’s awareness of needs in the LAC region and willingness to explore new opportunities. “It fits in the Conservation by Design Framework and into the perception that TNC is an “entrepreneurial organization in regards to the

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND THE PROGRAM STRATEGY FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN REGION

In 1999, under the leadership of Alexander Watson, Conservancy Vice President for International Programs, strategic planning for Conservancy programs in Latin America and the Caribbean began. The vision of the strategy reflects the Conservancy mission: “To assist countries, through partnerships, to build the capability and commitment to conserve their biological diversity and the natural systems necessary to sustain life.”

Within a framework of ecoregional planning and rigorous measurement of impacts the strategy is implemented by: 1) working with partner organizations and helping to build their capacity to conserve biodiversity; 2) protecting critically important biodiversity sites; and c) using science to guide Conservancy actions. (“Recommendations...,”p. 1)

Systems—influencing official and non-official systems, institutions and actors seeking to translate site-based conservation lessons into effective tools to conserve large numbers of sites where there is no Conservancy investment. Such influence may leverage opportunities for community conservation; change the behavior of key institutions in important ways; experiment with diverse approaches involving government, civil society, private enterprise and other sectors and categories of collaborators. (“Recommendations

Alliances—solving pressing problems and developing and testing new ideas and approaches. Alliances fall into two general categories: best practices networks; high payoff networks to develop and test new ideas and approaches. (“Recommendations

Crosscutting thematic and support programs, of which the Community Conservation Program is one, are to:

- # Evaluate the demands of country programs for technical support and devise strategies for responding to these demands;
- # Provide access to information and counsel;
- # Advance conservancy thinking and skills by developing new methods and techniques;
- # Offer training opportunities for TNC in new skill areas;
- # Promote a culture of constructive peer review;
- # Help to set and communicate standards;
- # Help to establish, communicate and monitor practical approaches;
- # Provide support to alliance level initiatives; and
- # Participate in interactive priority-setting exercises (“Recommendations

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND THE PARKS IN PERIL PROGRAM

The Parks in Peril (PIP) Program, launched in 1990 by the Nature Conservancy, is to “secure the survival of some of the most endangered and biologically important areas in Latin America and the Caribbean.” (Mansour, p. ix) Parks in Peril, the largest program supporting parks in the western hemisphere, works to achieve minimum critical park management by: a) establishing on-site protection; b) integrating protected areas into the economic and cultural life of local communities; c) creating long-term funding mechanisms to sustain the local management of these areas and d) using the experiences of PIP site-based activities to influence conservation in other sites in the region’s most imperiled ecosystems. (Mansour, p. xi)

Many PIP sites receive funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), which gives priority to the conservation of biodiversity. USAID seeks to achieve four results: a) basic on-site protection activities; b) long-term management capacity; c) long term financing for basic site management; d) a supportive local constituency for the site. (“Measuring Success

The fourth result, to develop a community constituency, directly addresses community conservation. Within this result success is seen as: a) an increased awareness by communities of the importance of the protected areas; b) an increased participation of local people in their management; c) increased economic benefits for community members from their maintenance. Success is measured by assessing four indicators: a) broad-based management committee/technical advisory committee; b) community involvement in compatible resource use; c) policy agenda development at national/regional /local levels; and d) environmental education programs. (“Measuring Success

The overall PIP approach is to work with local partners, environmental non-governmental organizations, who in turn work with local communities. Therefore, PIP has a fundamental interest in community conservation. “As our partners strengthen their presence in the Parks in Peril sites they become increasingly engaged with the local communities and their leaders.... Little by little a dialogue is progressing wherein we can better appreciate the rights and needs of local communities while communities gain an understanding of our concern for the biological resources that surround them. We recognize the need for local voices in building a constituency for protected areas. Working together we are changing national and international policies and creating incentives to sustain local conservation efforts and economies.” (Mansour, p. xii)

Specifically, PIP asserts that local communities must have a voice in the management of protected areas. Project personnel work with local leaders and residents to assess community resource use, socio-economic needs and land tenure status, and “...provide them with the tools necessary to protect the natural resources on which they depend.” (Mansour, p. 7) Among the communities “the issues confronting biodiversity conservation are broadly the same uncertain land tenure and resource rights, population growth and colonization, non-sustainable resource use and the rights of traditional peoples to name a few—but each site is unique as every protected area involves its own set of stakeholders, natural features, environmental laws and policy framework, economic concerns...” (Mansour, p. 9)

In 1995 Katrina Brandon, Kent Redford and Steven Sanderson edited *Parks in Peril: People, Politics and Protected Areas*, a review of cases from various PIP sites. In their review they emphasize that “ensuring the long-term protection of sites means that the conservation community must be able to adequately analyze the impact of historical, social, and political trends across sites and use such analysis to develop long lasting, effective solutions.” (Brandon, p. 4)

The authors write of the social forces shaping park protection and conservation. “It is evident that just as biodiversity is scale dependent so too are the social forces that shape how the biodiversity is used, managed, or destroyed.” (Brandon, p. 9) “Understanding the social

context is an essential base for effective action.” (Brandon, p. 10) Katrina Brandon, University of Maryland faculty, states that “an illusion exists among conservationists that what they are doing is conservation—when ... it is clear that they are really doing large scale social interventions in complicated settings.” (Brandon, p. 417)

Brandon writes that the social context from the perspective of a park, is usually the set of threats that faces a park—expanding agricultural frontiers, illegal hunting and logging, fuelwood collection and uncontrolled burning, colonization, cattle grazing, and large scale development and infrastructure. “Virtually all threats to biodiversity result from human actions—usually from different types of uses by different social groups” (Brandon, p. 415) “The local social context that affects park management often includes: the types and patterns of resource use and production; ...demographic factors such as infant mortality, local rates of population increase, and settlement patterns; local tenure security; differences in gender roles in production; levels of local organization, and access to technical changes or changes in consumption.” (Brandon, p. 415)

Brandon notes that conservationists must change the expectation that parks are supposed to be the cornerstone of sustainable development activities and refocus their attention and actions on biodiversity conservation. She maintains that “meeting the challenges outside of protected areas is best left to professionals from other disciplines with expertise in rural development” who would first, “intensively promote sustainable development initiatives outside of parks” and second, “focus renewed attention on addressing the fundamental economic and policy incentives that drive unsustainable land use and management.” (Brandon, p. 418)

Conservationists must reformulate community conservation to focus on the conservation of biodiversity. In this regard, Brandon suggests areas where the principles of community conservation need to be brought to bear:

- # Establishing parks—the type of park chosen should depend on the social context. For example, a biosphere is more socially complex (i.e., people living inside the park and systems of use regulations) than are conventional parks; (Brandon, p. 421)
- # Determining local participation appropriate to the type of park (i.e., biosphere reserves require high levels of local involvement in zoning, monitoring, and management); (Brandon, p. 438)
- # Clarifying land and resource tenure to minimize uncertainty that leads to unsustainable use; (Brandon, p. 438)
- # Being explicit with local populations over management decisions that may have implications for equity concerns. “Equity issues or a sense of “fairness” can be extremely important in how local people respond to parks perceived threats, and partners.” (Brandon, p. 431)

In *Parks in Peril: People, Politics and Protected Areas*, the chapter, “Analyzing the Social Context at PIP Sites” by Barbara Dugleby and Michelle Libby divides community

conservation activities into four categories: a) local awareness and environmental education; b) natural resource management; c) compatible economic development; d) local involvement in protected area management.

The major theme is the development of strong community constituency to mitigate threats to conservation. Creating such a constituency is a long and slow process. “This process most commonly begins with an attempt on the part of outside organizations and park staff to develop good relations with local residents, winning local support for the park and educating locals about the benefits and management needs of the site. As a means of winning local support NGOs often initiate projects that produce a direct and immediate benefit to locals—responding to the needs most strongly expressed by communities, not necessarily related to conservation or the protected area. Projects typically address issues such as health, sanitation, and general community development.” (Brandon, p. 74)

The process, Dugleby and Libby contend, assumes that after gaining the trust of locals through investing time and resources in their needs, environmental organizations can enter a phase in which they move closer to issues more directly related to the management of the protected area, such as natural resource management. “Focusing on issues of natural resource use allows partners and community residents to address and begin reducing locally induced threats to the protected area such as hunting, forest extraction, agricultural practices, and fishing. As conservation programs evolve, locals typically play an increasing role in designing and implementing projects and in park management as a whole. Ultimately, locals are fully engaged not only in park management, but also in integrated monitoring programs that provide important feedback on the impacts of their activities.” (Brandon, p. 74)

Community Conservation and The Conservancy’s Local People’s Program:

In 1994, the Local People’s Program was established within the Conservation Science Department of the Latin America and Caribbean Division of the Nature Conservancy. The program was an outgrowth of the Conservancy’s involvement with the Parks in Peril Program. A Local People Specialist was hired. This title was subsequently changed to Human Ecologist and then to its current title, Community Conservation Program Manager.

The Local People’s Program was to concentrate on the relationship between biodiversity conservation, protected area management, and local human populations by: a) implementing better field-based programs; b) training staff; c) assessing Conservancy portfolios. Specifically, the program was to:

- # Develop a strategy for working with local people, focusing on traditional peoples;
- # Provide assistance and training in developing and implementing programs with local peoples;
- # Develop new partnerships with organizations that have expertise with local people;

- # Survey and share lessons learned;
- # Work with the director of training to assess the role of gender in all programs and develop ways of improving training, implementation and research in activities concerning gender and natural resource use. (Local People's Specialist..., p. 1)

The job description for the Community Conservation Program Manager in 1997 was concerned also with "the relationship between biodiversity, conservation, protected area management and local human populations" and "working with local communities on biodiversity conservation and protected area management." The specific focus on gender was eliminated from the job description but remained as a crosscutting expectation in interviews of potential candidates. (Community Conservation Program Manager..., p. 1)

In the draft document "Linking Community-Based Efforts to Protected Area Threats," April, 1996, the director of the Local People's Program wrote that "for the Conservancy the most important objective of working with local communities is to remove or reduce threats to biodiversity" and "to improve the capacity of LACR and our partners to design and manage community-based initiatives that: a) are linked directly to protected area threats (i.e., as identified from a threat's analysis); b) incorporate monitoring and evaluation considerations; c) allow for adaptive management and local participation." (Dugelby, p. 1)

In support of the Local People's Program funds were provided to establish a Local Peoples Balancing Theme in 1997. The goal was to gain an understanding of local communities at Parks in Peril sites and to understand how those communities interact with and have an impact on the protected areas. This understanding was to help: 1) develop local constituencies; 2) identify and prioritize activities to reduce threats to protected areas; 3) progress to site consolidation. Three methods were to be used to gather the information needed - resource use analysis, gender analysis and adaptive management. (Local People's Balancing Theme..., p. 1)

Resource use analysis is to help fill the need for socioeconomic and socio-ecological information, in order to address the needs and aspirations of local people and to integrate protected area management and benefits into their daily lives. Such data would include, for example, local resource use patterns, community resource institutions, and land tenure that could pose threats to or facilitate the conservation process. (Local People's Balancing Theme..., p. 1)

Gender analysis is to "increase our understanding of the household and community responsibilities borne by women and men at PIP sites;" in order to "incorporate gender analysis into all components of our work with local communities including rapid ecological assessments, human ecological profiles, monitoring and other more detailed studies or assessments." (Local People's Balancing Theme

Gender analysis is to examine women and men at various ages and stages, within various income levels and ethnic groups to "better prepare us to successfully integrate local people into project planning and implementation." The workplan makes it clear that "in practice

gender analysis does not stand alone, but rather is discussed or studied in the context of a particular problem or issue, e.g., resource extraction or agroforestry.” (Local People’s Balancing Theme..., p. 3)

Adaptive management is a dynamic process of integrated management whereby social, biophysical, economic factors are considered. The action to be taken is to conduct a workshop for partners to include the key steps in community-based adaptive management. (Local People’s Balancing Theme...,p. 4)

Finally, A Local People’s Working Group was developed to advise the work of the Local People’s Program. A memo to this group in 1997 emphasized that:

- # Community initiatives should be in some way linked to a specific threat or threats;
- # Partners should consider indicators of success and methods they will use to monitor those indicators throughout the year; and
- # Partners and the Conservancy should track local involvement in projects, by number, gender and mode of participation (Local People’s Working Group, p. 1)

As an initial step in launching the Local People’s Program Barbara Dugelby and Michelle Libby reviewed the community conservation activities within the Parks in Peril Program in order to review and assess “the program’s efforts to build local constituencies and integrate local communities into protected area management” (Dugelby and Libby, p. 1)

The review was framed by three themes: first, community conservation can provide alternatives to the many subsistence activities of local communities which are not compatible with the ecological integrity of the park; second, it is important to examine the types of activities and how they are linked to the threats facing protected areas; third, the results of the review can help to “integrate the protected areas into the lives of the local people by helping partners with the planning and implementing of compatible resource use and development activities.” (Dugelby and Libby, p. 1)

Five categories of community-based initiatives were used in the review: awareness building; natural resource management; compatible and sustainable development (economic development); activities that engage local people in planning and evaluation of projects. The results of the assessment found that most partners are working on developing trust and an awareness of conservation. There is a need to move beyond the initial stages of building a local constituency to actually reducing locally-induced threats to the protected area and although partners are implementing many compatible development projects they do not appear to reduce threats, or improve the ecological integrity of the protected area. (Dugelby and Libby, p. 3)

Finally, a major focus of the Local People’s Program was the development of the Human Ecological Profile (HEP), a tool for gathering social data within communities living in or around protected areas. The purpose of the HEP was to develop “a strong understanding of

the relationship between local communities and protected areas and to use the information as a basis for well-targeted and monitored community-based conservation initiatives.” It represented an opportunity to identify conflicts between local communities and the protected area and opportunities for improving management. (Dugelby and Russell, p. 5)

The HEP was replaced under the Community Conservation Program, which followed the Local People’s program in 1998, by the integration of socio-economic data gathering into the on-going analytical tools of the Conservancy, for example the “Site-Based Conservation Planning.” The process—as well as the tool used—is called “Human Context Analysis.”

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM TODAY

Institutional Development Department

The mission of this department is to promote shared learning with partner organizations to build and strengthen the individual skills and long-term institutional capacity needed to further biodiversity conservation in the region. The department, formerly called the Training Department, promotes in-region training capacity, disseminates knowledge and experience gained by the Conservancy and partners and initiates learning and dialogue in areas outside of the Conservancy’s or partners’ traditional knowledge and experience base.

Compatible Economic Development Department and Ecotourism

In 1997, a Conservancy conservation committee stressed the “great promise” of compatible economic development for the Conservancy mission and developed two criteria that they suggested be met if the Conservancy is to be involved in “compatible development.” They are, first, that the proposed economic activity is primarily designed to mimic or restore essential ecological processes; and second, that the proposed activity will reduce threats to the conservation target and not otherwise degrade the relevant ecological processes. (Runnels, p. 2)

In 1999, the Compatible Economic Development Department was formed within the International Program. The mission of the Department is to strengthen the relationship of conservation, economic development and healthy communities. The Department builds on the economic emphasis in “Conservation by Design” and it addresses a question often asked, namely, “Why should the Conservancy be involved with economic development?” the Department answers that implementing economic activities protects biodiversity by “providing alternative sources of income to local peoples, adding economic value to the land...and generating revenues to further the conservation agenda and strengthen local

In 1998 the Conservancy initiated the Ecotourism Program within the Institutional Development Department. The program was transferred to the Compatible Economic

Development Department in 1999 with a mission to “provide technical assistance to partners and country programs in order to better harness the potential of ecotourism as a conservation tool that contributes to the long-term protection of biodiversity and the natural resources upon which it is based.” (Ecotourism Strategy, p. 4) The program has both the goal to develop tools to reduce threats posed by tourism and to develop tools to facilitate the development of ecotourism that will strengthen conservation. (Ecotourism Strategy, p. 5)

Conservation Science’s Community Conservation Program

Community Conservation Program

In 1998, the Community Conservation Program (CCP) replaced the Local People’s Program, although the mission was the same: “to concentrate on the relationship between biodiversity conservation, protected area management, and local human populations” (Community Conservation Program Manager, p. 1). While this relationship has traditionally been conceived in terms of “local peoples” (i.e., indigenous groups, smallholder agriculturalists, artisanal fishers), both the philosophy and the practice of what is now understood to be community conservation is, by necessity, quite broad. From an historical concentration at the site level, community conservation also has important roles to play at larger geographic and institutional scales. Issues of migration, population pressures and determinant socio-political structures are crucial elements for the goal of long-term biodiversity conservation. Understanding these issues and incorporating them into conservation planning and implementation requires a broad-based approach to community conservation, one which expands the analytical and applied role of the CCP beyond the traditional concept of working primarily with local people.

The CCP thus seeks to include the human dimension within all of the five “S” stages as appropriate. This process requires a better understanding of the relationship between human populations and conservation and innovation in the application of the Conservancy’s site conservation planning methodology. To this end, the CCP concentrates on training partners on the complexity of the human-biodiversity relationship and in the use of analytical tools to improve the understanding of that relationship. Such tools include participatory field research methods, new uses of mapping technologies, demographic analyses and inclusive approaches to strategy design and implementation. The CCP also facilitates the exchange of ideas by bringing together conservationists from different groups who face similar challenges through south-south exchanges, shared learning and documentation of community conservation experiences.

Divisional community conservation programs extend the reach of the Community Conservation Program beyond the central Conservation Science Department. Two examples are the program in the Andean and Southern Cone (ASC) and the program in Mexico. The ASC is the only division within the International Program to have committed to a full-time staff position for community conservation. The mission of the ASC’s Community Conservation Program is “to enhance conservation success and reduce protected area threats

by building capacity within the Division, in-country partners and community organizations to involve local communities in protected area management decisions that affect their lives, lands and economic livelihoods as well as the future of conservation sites.” (Strategic Plan, p. 3)

Working in conjunction with CCP staff, the Andean and Southern Cone developed a matrix for profiling community conservation activities. The criteria of the matrix, which shows the program focus, includes: a) completion and use of a threats analysis to guide on-site work; b) ability of the partner to carry out community conservation work as judged by their level of training; c) thoroughness and application of the Human Context Analysis; and d) the development and application of a monitoring program that includes community conservation elements. (Ulfelder, “Memo...” p. 2)

The Southern Mexico program has initiated projects and strategic planning processes to address community conservation issues, including the identification of staffing needs. The “Sustainable Communities Initiative” supports the establishment of sustainable community models which include developing criteria for assessing communities in terms of their impact on an areas’ conservation targets; designing a monitoring and evaluation system and promoting networks of community practitioners. The methodological framework is the same as that used for site conservation planning, objectives, information, analysis, strategies, actions and evaluation. Overall, the Initiative will “build strategies for community conservation programs that significantly contribute to the abatement of threats to natural resource conservation.” (“Sustainable

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AND THE ANDEAN AND SOUTHERN CONE: A REGIONAL EXAMPLE

Within the international program of The Nature Conservancy there is one division, the Andean and Southern Cone, that has a full time community conservation director. The region, therefore, provides lessons and best practices for other regions.

The strategic plan for the Andean and Southern Cone program begins with a rationale for community conservation: “The Conservancy believes an essential factor in achieving long-term conservation success is working with people living in and around the areas that it seeks to protect. Local communities, we know, hold the key to conservation success; without their support, we can never achieve our goals. Our community conservation work is especially important for the Conservancy’s Latin American and Caribbean Region where 86% of protected areas have people living within their borders and nearly all have human settlements in their immediate buffer zones....” (Strategic Plan..., p. 1)

The mission of the program is “to enhance conservation success and reduce protected area threats by building capacity within the Division in-country partners and community organizations to involve local communities in protected area management decisions that affect their lives, lands and economic livelihoods as well as the future of conservation sites.” (Strategic Plan..., p. 3)

The goals of the program are to:

- # Integrate community conservation initiatives with protected area management goals;
- # Increase local communities' awareness and appreciation of protected areas;
- # Improve local involvement and participation in conservation planning, management decisions and;
- # Foster and facilitate compatible livelihood activities that benefit local communities economically, ecologically and socially. Develop partner and local capacity for implementation of community conservation initiatives; and
- # Learn and leverage from community conservation work (Strategic Plan..., p. 15)

“Together these goals seek to gain local communities commitment to conservation.”
(Strategic Plan..., p. 3)

Overall, the strategy for the Andean and Southern Cone Program highlights diversity in that it is important “to consider that people of both sexes, all ages and all social classes receive benefits from the projects that are implemented in their communities.” (Strategic Plan 4)

Through a Community Conservation Diagnostic the Andean and Southern Cone, together with the Community Conservation Program, developed a scorecard for “telling us more about the quality of the work currently being implemented.” (Ulfelder, p. 1) The criteria of the scorecard used included: a) completion and use of a threats analysis to guide on-site work; b) ability of the partner to carry out community conservation work as judged by their level of training; c) thoroughness and application of the human context analysis; and d) the development and application of a monitoring program that includes community conservation elements. (Ulfelder, p. 1)

The program used other criteria for assessing the potential for working at any given site: a) the possibility of developing a management plan that includes community conservation considerations; b) the potential for leveraging community conservation lessons from that site to others in the Division and beyond; c) how “on-board” the partner and other organizations are for working on community conservation and the level of funding currently available for this type of work and the number and priority of deliverables due. (Ulfelder, p. 1)

“Participatory Conservation: Lessons of the PALOMAP study in Ecuador’s Cayambe-Coca completed as a collaborative activity of the Andean and Southern Cone Program on Community Conservation in 1998 and funded by the Ford Foundation. The lessons learned included:

- # Participatory conservation initiatives with local communities in and around protected areas must be directly related to the threats facing the protected area.
- # For local communities to be interested in participatory conservation, they must perceive the benefits of participatory initiatives. The relationship between the initiative's results and the conservation objectives must be explicitly recognized and discussed from the beginning, and a hypothesis on the nature of this relationship and on the initiative's expected benefits presented.
- # Participatory conservation initiatives should include mechanisms to measure the conservation effectiveness and fairness of their actions, results, and impacts.
- # The participation type influences the conservation effectiveness and fairness of the initiative.
- # The scale and type of participatory initiative must be appropriate to the scale, type and priority of the threat addressed.
- # Mechanisms must exist to prevent participatory conservation initiatives from generating new threats or exacerbating existing ones in protected areas and their buffer zones. (Ulfelder et al., p. 35)

PALOMAP has expanded with continued support from the Ford Foundation from an analytical project in Ecuador to an analysis, training and planning program in Ecuador, Peru and Brazil that may serve as a model for field-based community conservation work

COMMUNITY CONSERVATION, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY AND GENDER

Generally speaking four social variables are used in considering the characteristics of a community as they relate to conservation and natural resource management: ethnicity, age, income level and gender. The 1998 External Evaluation of the Parks in Peril project recognizes that some groups—women, indigenous people and adolescents—are more difficult than others to reach in the name of conservation and recommends that “TNC and their partners need to expand their network to have access to the experience of other NGOs that specialize in reaching women, indigenous groups and adolescents.”

Of the various social variables the book, *Parks in Peril: People, Politics, and Protected Areas*, emphasizes ethnicity. The chapter, “Analyzing the Social Context at PIP Sites” the authors Barbara Dugleby and Michelle Libby analyze only ethnicity in depth. In the preface to the book the authors write “The correspondence between indigenous land and forest cover is strong enough that one geographer has dubbed it the “rule of indigenous environments” which states “where there are indigenous peoples with a homeland there are still biologically rich environments.” (Brandon, p. 18) There are no such clear cut conservation “rules” for the other social variables.

Gender, however, is mentioned, with some ambivalence, in the same book from the Parks in Peril project. On the one hand Katrina Brandon recognizes that “gender roles in production” is part of the local context that affects park management (Brandon, p. 416). On the other hand the concluding chapter views gender as one of the “inexorable pressures” on parks to solve “the ills accumulated over centuries of capitalist excesses” (Brandon, p. 462). “Parks have become the stage on which many demand action to redress rural poverty, social justice, gender inequity, and the plight of indigenous peoples.” (Brandon, p. 463)

Overall, gender is considered at various points in the international division of the Conservancy community conservation program. The U.S. Partnership does not mention gender. The first job description for the Local People Specialist stated that the specialist was to “assess the role of gender in all programs and develop ways of improving training, implementation and research in activities concerning gender and natural resource use.”

...,” p. 1) It is notable that the job description for the Community Conservation Program Manager, established in 1997 to replace the Local People’s Specialist, is fundamentally the same as that of the earlier Local People Specialist. However, gender is not mentioned.

There are two substantive discussions of gender in the Conservancy literature. The first is in the work plan for the 1997 Local People’s Balancing Theme. Three methods for analysis are outlined: a) resource use; b) adaptive management and c) gender analysis. The use of gender analysis is seen as a way “to distinguish the activities and responsibilities of women and men at various ages and stages including evaluations that highlight socioeconomic distinctions such as class and ethnicity. A more complete understanding of the household and community responsibilities born by women and men will better prepare us to successfully integrate local people into project planning and implementation.” The objective, then, was to “incorporate gender analysis into all components of our work with local communities including rapid ecological assessments, human ecological profiles, monitoring and other more detailed studies or assessments.” (Local People’s Balancing Theme

The Local people’s Balancing Theme noted that although gender was “a separate subject under the local peoples balancing theme, in practice gender analysis does not stand alone, but rather is discussed or studied in the context of a particular problem or issue, e.g., resource extraction or agroforestry.” The two results of the gender component in the workplan were: a) develop a gender component for the human ecological profile and b) produce a primer on gender and natural resources. (Local People’s Balancing Theme

The second discussion of gender is a part of the External Evaluation of the Parks in Peril project. In the text of the report there is a section on “Gender and the Conservation of which includes a rationale for the inclusion of gender. “Gender analysis is a useful conservation tool for understanding communities and the institutions that support them within the protected areas. Men and women often have different roles in the management of natural resources; understanding who has access to and control of natural resources and who benefits from those resources is essential to sustainable conservation. For example, the team often found women defined as *amas de casa* (housewives) which masked their roles as daily managers of natural resources. Women are a significant force, both informally as

The Community Conservation Program staff has worked to integrate gender into Conservancy work in a variety of ways: a) uses gender as a core variable for analysis in the Site Conservation Planning Manual section on the Human Context Analysis; b) collaborates on training, development of case studies and conferences with the USAID supported project on Managing Ecosystems with a Gender Emphasis (MERGE); c) tries to strengthen the use of gender in field-based projects; d) sponsors training with a gender focus and e) collaborates with gender programs in other environment organizations, (e.g., the World Wildlife Women's Initiative); f) keeps track of other initiatives (e.g., The Sierra Club's focus on the empowerment of women, population dynamics and conservation); g) helped found the Community Conservation Coalition which has gender as a central part of its mission; h) is developing a message on population dynamics and the environment which includes the importance of gender.

There is good experience within the Parks in Peril Program in working with gender in the field (the Andean region, especially Ecuador) and there is evidence of some attempts to examine institutional aspects of conservation and gender (Sierra de Las Minas, Guatemala). An example from southern Mexico underscores the field response to the importance of considering gender with community conservation: in a workshop on lessons learned from community conservation gender was discussed in the course of two days by field personnel some 35 times.

The guidance from donors often includes the demand for attention to gender (e.g., the Ford Foundation, MacArthur Foundation). USAID, a primary Conservancy donor, provides guidance on gender through, for example, Contract Information Bulletin 99-13, "Evaluating

Gender Issues in Competitive Solicitations.” Finally the emphasis of the Conservancy on inclusiveness, equity and fairness, and the involvement of communities in conservation provides the framework for the inclusion of gender.

THE TOOLS OF THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

Two documents, “Designing a Geography of Hope” and *Beyond the Ark*, provide the context for the tools that The Nature Conservancy uses to implement conservation activities and measure their success. The first, *Beyond the Ark* written by William Weeks, Director of the Conservancy’s Center for Compatible Economic Development, provides core concepts that have shaped The Conservancy. Such concepts include the importance of an ecosystem approach, documenting and disseminating lessons learned and the support of the community. He suggests that “Conservation as we near the third millennium will have to be supported by a tripod. Perhaps the main load bearing leg is ecology. But the stability will be achieved only with the addition of two other legs, community and economy.” (Weeks, p. 39) He emphasizes that within the ecosystem approach that requires large land areas, “the support of the human community for conservation, always a desirable goal, is likely to become essential.” (Weeks, p. 39) Although Weeks emphasizes economic development (Weeks, pp. 39-40) he also writes that “real, lasting conservation nearly always requires community understanding of, pride in, and responsibility for the natural systems that surround and, after all, support the community’s social and economic systems.” (Weeks, p. 39)

Although conceptually based, *Beyond the Ark* is a practical handbook on ecosystem planning, providing, as the subtitle indicates, “tools for an ecosystem approach to conservation.” Weeks grounds his approach to planning in five “S’s”: systems, stresses, sources, strategies and success. “Briefly the planning objective is to understand the ecological *stresses* that burden it, trace the stresses to their socioeconomic *sources*, develop good *strategies* to address the sources and alleviate the stresses and, finally determine how to define *success* and measure progress.” (Weeks, p. 45) Interestingly, with regard to community conservation he mentions that some have suggested that the fourth “s” should be *social situation* instead of strategies. “It surely is critical to understand the attitudes, aspirations, and economic circumstances of the human communities affected by the conservation system we are working on. Indeed, only by obtaining this kind of understanding can we synthesize strategies that will be effective.” (Weeks, p. 47)

Weeks also looks at ways of measuring progress and comments that strategies for conservation of large and complex systems need to consider “the measure of society and economy right along with measurements of ecology.” (Weeks, p. 115) For example, he suggests a “balance sheet” developed by Greg Low of the Conservancy which tracks the capital and assets of a conservation project by measuring ecological systems (natural communities and species); economic systems (export of goods and services and local trade); and social systems (personal and institutional leadership, rural character, local history and culture, public services, housing, physical infrastructures, job skills training and development finance). (Weeks, p. 118).

The second document fundamental to understanding the tools for implementing conservation activities in the Conservancy and measuring success is “Designing a Geography of Hope: Guidelines for Ecoregion-Based Conservation in The Nature Conservancy.” It is meant to provide guidance for the implementation of the Conservancy’s ecoregional approach to conservation. (Designing..., p. 2) It complements the conservation framework laid out in the Conservancy’s fundamental document, “Conservation by Design.” The planning sections particularly address community conservation. Two criteria are used, biological distinctiveness and conservation status, in setting priorities for action among ecoregions.

Once the priority regions are chosen a *value for conservation capacity* is assigned. Conservation capacity is the entry point for community conservation and includes an analysis of: appropriate conservation policies; local or regional conservation groups active; funding available; sociopolitical attitudes supportive of conservation; ownership patterns or land tractable; grassroots land ethic sufficiently developed for sustainable conservation.” (Designing..., p. 22) Stakeholders are also identified and “can include members of the community (or communities) within the ecoregion ...” (Designing..., p. 26) In moving from planning to practice the role of the stakeholder is emphasized: “Identify stakeholder motivations and interests common to, or conflicting with, those of the Conservancy.” (Designing..., p. 53) Characteristics of human institutions, local communities and land use are given equal weight with ecological attributes for site conservation planning (Designing, p. 57)

The two questions from the community conservation perspective to be addressed are: “What current or potential human-related activities interfere with the maintenance of the functional ecological system?” “Which individuals, groups and institutions are likely to affect or be affected by attempts to achieve the site-based conservation goals?” (Designing, p. 58)

Beyond the Ark and the “Designing a Geography of Hope” provide the conceptual framework for the practice of an ecosystem approach to conservation. The actual tools provided by the Conservancy for the practitioner are many including, for example, “Landscape-Scale, Community Conservation: A Practitioner’s Handbook” by Greg Low for the U.S. Partnership and the planned Human Context Analysis Manual and the PALOMAP methodology for community participation by William Ulfelder et. al. in the international program. However, there are two core tools that guide the implementation of the activities of the Conservancy: Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Success and The Parks in Peril Consolidation Scorecard .

Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Success:

There are three particularly relevant documents that deal with site conservation planning, the site conservation training document; the Spanish translation document on site conservation planning, “Planificación para la Conservación de Sitios”; “Site Conservation Planning; and Measures of Conservation Success.”

Site Conservation Training: In the Conservancy's site conservation planning training workshop the gathering of human and socioeconomic information is paramount. "The assessment of the human and socio-economic context is an essential component of the site conservation planning process. Just as you cannot understand a natural community without gathering ecological data, you cannot understand the human community without looking at how its social and economic makeup shapes its relationship with TNC. And it has recently become even more important now that the Conservancy is working in larger scale sites where interacting with local communities and community-based conservation is being emphasized." (Site Conservation Planning Workshop, Section 5)

"Understanding local human and socioeconomic conditions can suggest both opportunities and obstacles to success. The Nature Conservancy's experience has shown that acting without sufficient understanding can lead to misunderstanding, misconceptions and serious problems with the community—while working with an understanding of the local community can be critical to the success of some projects." (Site Conservation Planning Workshop, Section 5)

The training manual also offers guidance on collecting and organizing information. "Gathering human and socioeconomic information should be a focused search. It is helpful to group human and socioeconomic considerations at a site into the following categories: land use and economics, laws and policies, constituencies, cultural attitudes, and general demographics. Seeking information in regard to these categories contributes to the process of framing key issues, looks at the implications for TNC's role in the community, and informs the threats assessment, stakeholder analysis, situation diagrams, strategies, and actions." (Site Conservation Planning Workshop, Section 5)

Planificación para la Conservación de Sitios: The Site Conservation Planning Handbook was revised in 1999 and translated into Spanish in June 1999. In the Spanish document community conservation is fully integrated in the four stages of the planning process: a) information gathering; b) analysis; c) strategies; d) implementation.

Information gathering: The handbook stresses that in gathering information relevant to the site to be protected the both the ecological context and the human context are assessed. The human context is to include information on the economic, political and social context and the handbook suggests ways to gather such information in a rapid, efficient manner using a variety of methodologies including participatory techniques. The handbook states that a human context analysis contributes, among others, to: a) a better understanding of the impact of the political, economic and social systems that influence site conservation; b) the promotion of community participation in site planning; c) participatory monitoring and evaluation. (Planificación..., p. 31)

Analysis: Within the analysis stage of the planning process the analysis of stakeholders is highlighted in the handbook in assessing the human context. Such analysis asks the questions, "What individuals and groups influence the sites?" "What are their interests and how can they help reach the goals of the site?" "How can we work with these stakeholders most effectively?" (Planificación... Overall, the analysis section stresses the

Strategies: The third stage in the planning process is to develop strategies for conservation. There are a variety of strategies listed in the handbook which include for example, protection of soils and water, ecological restoration, fund raising. (Planificacion..., p. 71) One of the strategies singled out for review is community-based programs and the cooperation and involvement of stakeholders. This strategy includes working with local people to create an alliance to gain the support of the community for the conservation site and to promote sustainable development. It also includes the objective to increase local knowledge and pride in the site through publicity, exchanges and educational activities. (Planificacion..., p. 73)

Implementation: In the handbook there are four substantive areas around which activities should be designed for implementation and community conservation is one of the four: a) protection of the site; b) management of the site; c) community participation; d) finance, budget and personnel. (Planificacion..., p. 38) The implementation stage also includes monitoring and evaluation—a means to measure success. The three general indicators for measuring success are the strengthening of biodiversity health; reduction in threats to the site; development of site capacity. Community Conservation is particularly relevant to the development of site capacity. (Planificacion...,p. 65) The handbook uses the specific indicators for measuring the progress of a site have been developed under the Parks in Peril program through the scorecard manual.

Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Success: A Practitioner's Handbook: This document is based on the five “S’s” of the Nature Conservancy - systems, stresses, sources, strategies and success. It refers to Community Conservation but does not emphasize it in the same way as does the Spanish translation. The first three “S’s” do not explicitly address community conservation. However, the manual does say that “Understanding the natural environment as well as the human context (situation) at a site underlies the application of the Five-S framework. Thus two types of information are fundamental to the planning process, ecological information and human context information.” (Site Conservation Planning, p. 11)

The chapter on “Conservation Strategies” suggests that, “broadly speaking, there are three complementary strategic approaches that can be deployed to abate critical threats and maintain or restore the conservation targets: Land and water conservation, public policies and compatible development alternatives” (Site Conservation Planning, p. 31) “Any or all of these strategic approaches may require community-based programs designed to secure short-term and long-term community support.” (Site Conservation Planning, p. 33) Although the community-based strategy is not described the source referred to for help with community-based conservation is “Landscape-Scale, Community-Based Conservation: A Practitioners Handbook by Greg Low of the Conservancy.

Three general indicators are mentioned for measuring conservation success. They are “biodiversity health,” “threat status and abatement,” “conservation capacity.” It is particularly with conservation capacity that the measures of success for community conservation should be found. (Site Conservation Planning, p. 44) The three indicators for conservation capacity are “Project Leadership and Support,” “Strategic Approach,” “Funding

Although the text related to conservation capacity does not mention community conservation, Appendix C of the document, “A Step-by-Step Approach to Assessing Conservation Capacity,” does mention as an indicator of success: “Project director or manager has participated in a Community-Based Conservation fellowship program...” (Site Conservation Planning, Appendix C5)

Measuring Success: The Parks in Peril Consolidation Scorecard Manual: There are four areas used to assess a protected area under the Parks in Peril program: a) basic protected activities; b) long-term Management; c) long-term financing; d) site constituency. Under each area are indicators for measuring success. Benchmarks on a scale from one to five track the progress of each indicator. The area most relevant to community conservation is site constituency, which uses four indicators:

Broad-based management committee/technical advisory committee: This indicator assures that there is participation of local communities and other stakeholders in the reserve management process and that “representation and participation are viewed as two integral features of all effective management or advisory committees.” (Measuring Success...p. 18) The benchmarks range from one, advisory committee non-existent to five, advisory committee an active participant in reserve management decisions.

Community involvement in compatible resource use: The assumption underlying this indicator is that conservation depends on the communities living in and around the protected area to use “biological resources in a manner that is compatible with the biodiversity conservation goals of the protected area.” (Measuring Success The benchmarks list differing levels of engagement by individuals and by community organizations in pilot projects for compatible resource use based on the idea that “only by working in collaboration with community organizations will a pilot project be able to influence enough resource-users to bring about a significant reduction of threats to biodiversity.” (Measuring Success 19)

Policy agenda development at national/regional/local levels: “Protected areas can support the conservation of biological diversity insofar as local, regional, national, and international policies that promote biodiversity conservation allow these sites to function effectively and to thrive.” (Measuring Success..., p. 20) The benchmarks range from “no action being taken to develop or promote conservation policies for park security.” to “conservation policies that promote park security being actively pursued at all appropriate levels.” (Measuring Success..., p. 20)

Environmental education programs: Environmental education is one strategy for attaining the support of local stakeholders and others. Such programs cover a broad range of activities. However, “a common denominator is often a systematic explanation to local residents of the

importance of the protected area and of the rules and regulations relating to it.” established environmental education program refers to one that has been in effect for more than a year and that has made multiple attempts to communicate its basic message to local residents and other protected-area stakeholders, including public and private ones.” (Measuring Success..., p. 21)

The authors of the document make it clear that this “scorecard” site’s progress towards consolidation.” Consolidation means the site has the infrastructure and personnel to deal with threats to the conservation of biodiversity in a protected area.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The main conclusions of the literature review are as follows:

1. Substantive Themes

The core documents of the Nature Conservancy underscore the importance of community conservation especially in developing a conservation ethic that affirms the link between a healthy environment and human prosperity and compatible development that harnesses the marketplace. “Love of place” and community support also are regarded critical elements for conservation. Conservation goals and objectives are reached through collaborative efforts that actively involve a broad spectrum of people, both men and women, and rely on an interdisciplinary, holistic approach. Site capacity is often the entry point for community conservation as the capacity of a protected area to practice conservation depends on sociopolitical attitudes, strong local conservation groups and other community responses. Gathering socioeconomic data for site-based planning is given equal weight to the need for biological information. However, the documents for site-based planning are less clear about the role for community conservation in the other phases of the planning process.

2. Strategic Approach

There are a variety of different ideas and approaches to community conservation within the Conservancy, particularly within the International Program. For example, Katrina Brandon insists that parks should not be considered the cornerstone of sustainable development activities. She maintains this expectation needs to be changed so reserves can refocus on biodiversity conservation. (Brandon, p. 418) At the other extreme, is the approach often used by Conservancy partners which is to initiate projects that produce direct and immediate benefit to locals in order to win their trust and support, whether or not they address “threat

Also, the core Conservancy documents and the U.S. Partnership seem to emphasize the involvement of key community stakeholders and leaders; whereas the International Program

seeks the active participation of the community as a whole in a wide variety of activities. The Conservancy emphasizes “economic development” activities. “Social” and “community” activities are terms often used in tandem with economic development. These terms need to be defined and clarified.

3. Mandate

The mandate for the Community Conservation Program is unclear. The CCP was created under Parks in Peril (PIP); therefore, its historical focus has been Latin America and the Caribbean. As a PIP project it is to implement the PIP objectives for community conservation, namely, to foster:

- # An increased awareness by communities of the importance of the protected areas;
- # Increased participation of local people in their management;
- # Increased economic benefits for community members from their maintenance.

However, there are other more general mandates for a community conservation program as outlined in Conservancy documents. For example, “Conservation by Design” recommends such a program focus on two action steps: first, to “build central mentoring and logistical support for community-based conservation” and second, to “revise the site conservation planning methodology to more explicitly include components of community-based conservation strategies...” (Implementing Conservation by Design, p. 6)

“Geography of Hope” would have a community conservation program deal with two questions: “What current or potential human-related activities interfere with the maintenance of the functional ecological system?” “Which individuals, groups and institutions are likely to affect or be affected by attempts to achieve the site-based conservation goals?” (Designing a Geography..., p. 58) Finally, the Latin America and Caribbean Strategy both outlines specific tasks for a crosscutting thematic program such as community conservation and integrates community conservation into the site, systems and alliance level.

4. Administrative Structure

Community conservation is present at different levels throughout the Conservancy. The U.S. Partnership has as one locus for community conservation the “Center for Compatible Economic Development” in Leesburg, Virginia. Within the International Program there are three units that deal with community conservation, The Institutional Development Department, the Compatible Economic Development Department that includes the Ecotourism Program, and the Community Conservation Program within the Conservation Science Department. Finally, there are regional programs in Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific for community conservation, some with full time staff.

Recommendations

As a result of this literature review the following recommendations emerge for the next steps of the strategic planning process for the Community Conservation Program:

- # To define and clarify the overall approach to community conservation within the International Program;
- # To revisit and clarify the Community Conservation Program mission, goals and objectives in order to create a vision that may include, for example, the interaction of conservation with population dynamics; health and nutrition as a conservation strategy; the role of environmental education; compatible resource use and economic development and the role of women in conservation; and
- # To clarify the roles and responsibilities of the administrative structure of community conservation within the International Program and set up mechanisms for collaboration.

These recommendations are to guide the Community Conservation Program strategic planning process. The process must complement the current strategic planning for the Latin America and Caribbean region, take into consideration the Asia and Pacific Program and fit in with the Nature Conservancy's overall framework for community conservation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brandon, Katrina, Kent H. Redford, Steven E. Sanderson. *Parks in Peril: People, Politics, and Protected Areas*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1998.
- “Community Conservation Program Manager: Job Opportunity.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. September, 1997.
- “Community-Based Conservation: International Program” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1998.
- “Conservation by Design: A Framework for Mission Success.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1998.
- “Conservation Goals, Measures and Strategies: U.S. Conservation Partnership: Discussion Draft.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. 1999.
- Minutes. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. March 16, 1999.
- “Description of Local Peoples Balancing Themes Work for FY '96 and '97.” Unpublished Draft Report. Arlington, Va.: Latin America and Caribbean Division, The Nature Conservancy.
- “Designing a Geography of Hope: Guidelines for Ecoregion-Based Conservation in The Nature Conservancy.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. 1997.
- Dugelby, Barbara and Michelle Libby. “A Review and Assessment of Community Activities of the Parks in Peril Program of the Nature Conservancy.” Draft of Unpublished Report. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1997.
- Dugelby, Barbara and Vance Russell. “Human Ecological Profiles of Protected Areas.” Arlington, Virginia: Community Conservation program, Latin America and Caribbean Division, The Nature Conservancy, 1998.
- Dugelby, Barbara. “Linking Community-Based Efforts to Protected Area Threats.” Unpublished Draft Paper. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1996.
- “Ecosystem Strategy: Draft Working Proposal.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. May, 1999.
- “Establishment of a Compatible Economic Development Department: A Concept Paper.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. June, 8, 1999.

- “External Evaluation of LAC Regional Parks in Peril Project.” Gainesville, Florida: Tropical Research and Development, Inc. May, 1998.
- Gallagher, Megan. “Pathways: Building a Local Initiative for Compatible Economic Development.” Leesburg, Virginia: Center for Compatible Economic Development, The Nature Conservancy. 1997.
- “International Strategy: White Paper for Board of Governors Retreat” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, February 4, 1999.
- “Implementing Conservation by Design: Our Strategic Focus for the Next Ten Years.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, May, 1998.
- Leon, Patricia. “Current LACD Involvement in Compatible Economic Development Activities.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. January 30, 1998.
- “Local People’s Specialist: Job Opportunity.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. October, 1994.
- “Local Peoples Balancing Theme: Workplan FY ’97.” Unpublished Draft Report. Arlington, Va.: Latin America and Caribbean Division, The Nature Conservancy.
- “Local Peoples Working Group.” Unpublished Memorandum. Arlington, Virginia.: Latin America and Caribbean Division, The Nature Conservancy.
- Low, Greg et al., “Pathways: Building a Local Initiative for Compatible Economic Virginia : Center for Compatible Economic Development, The Nature Conservancy. 1997.
- Low, Greg. “Ecosystem Conservation and Economic Development.” Unpublished Report. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy.
- Low, Greg. “Landscape-Scale, Community-Based Conservation: A Practitioner’s Handbook.” Arlington, Virginia: Center for Compatible Development, The Nature Conservancy. 1998.
- Mansour, Jane et al. “Parks in Peril Source Book.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, America Verde Publications. 1995.
- “Measuring Success: The Parks in Peril Consolidation Scorecard Manual.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. 1999.
- Perspectivas Desde Airlie: La Conservacion Basada en la Comunidad. New York City: La Fundacion Liz Claiborne y Art Ortenberg. 1993.

- “Planificacion Para la Conservacion de Sitios” (draft). Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, June, 1999.
- “Recommendations for a Program Strategy for the Latin America and Caribbean Region of the Nature Conservancy.” Draft. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. January 18, 1999.
- Redford, Kent H. and Monica Ostria, “Parks in Peril Source Book.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, America Verde, 1995.
- Runnels, Bruce. “Memorandum: Compatible Human and Economic Use Activity by TNC.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, December, 1997.
- Sawhill, John. “Your Tree or Mine? A Blueprint of Choices” Washington, D.C.: Washington Post, Sunday, October 11, 1998.
- Sawhill, John. “The Good Neighbor Policy.” *Nature Conservancy*. Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, January/February, 1998.
- Site Conservation Planning Workshop. Chicago, Illinois: The Nature Conservancy. April 7-9, 1999.
- “Site Conservation Planning and Measures of Conservation Success: A Practitioner’s Handbook.” (Revised Draft) Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. September, 1999.
- “Strategic Plan: Community Conservation Program of the Andean/Southern Cone Division.” Arlington, Virginia: Latin America and Caribbean Region, The Nature Conservancy. 1998.
- “Sustainable Communities Initiative for Mexico.” Arlington, Virginia: Mexico Division of the Nature Conservancy. 1999.
- “The Year in Conservation: International Program.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1997.
- “The Year in Conservation: International Program.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy, 1998.
- Ulfelder, William H., et al., “Participatory Conservation: Lessons of the PALOMAP Study in Ecuador’s Caytambe Coca Ecological Reserve.” Arlington, Virginia: America Verde Publications, The Nature Conservancy. 1998.
- Ulfelder, William. “Memo: ASC Division Community Conservation Diagnostic.” Arlington, Virginia: The Nature Conservancy. March 9, 1999.

Weeks, William. *Beyond the Ark*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press. 1997.

“Working with Communities to Save the Last Great Places.” Arlington, Virginia: The nature Conservancy. 1998.

“Workplans for FY 96.” Mexico City, Mexico: USAID. June 19, 1996.

Zadroga, Frank. “Memorandum: Local Peoples and Conservation Science Balancing Themes.” Mexico City: USAID/Mexico.